### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

INTERNAT	TIONAL SEARC	HING AUTH	IORITY					
To: JACQUELINE M. ARENDT ARENDT & ASSOCIATES INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP				PCT				
				WATE	WRITTEN OPINION OF THE			
1740 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE BOXBOROUGH, MA 01719-2209					ONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY			
	-				(PCT Rule 43bis.1)			
				Date of mailing (day/month/year)	09 JUN 2003			
Applicant's or agent's file reference  BLP-208PCT				FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below				
	nal application N	0.	International filing date	(day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)			
PCT/US05/00603		09 January 2005 (09.01.2005)		10 January 2004 (10.01.2004)				
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classifica			or both national classificat	ion and IPC				
IPC(7): A	61K 9/06, 7/00 aı	nd US Cl.: 424	4/401, 427; 514/969					
Applicant								
BIOLIPID	), INC.							
				-				
1. This c	opinion contains i	indications rel	ating to the following item	ıs:				
$\boxtimes$	Box No. I	Basis of the	e opinion		-			
	Box No. II	Priority						
$\boxtimes$	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability						
	Box No. IV	Lack of uni	ity of invention					
$\boxtimes$	Box No. V		Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement					
	Box No. VI	Certain doc	cuments cited					
	Box No. VII	Certain def	ects in the international ap	plication				
	Box No. VIII	Certain obs	ervations on the internation	nal application				
	THER ACTIO							
Intern: Autho	ational Prelimina	ary Examinin	g Authority ("IPEA") ex	cept that this does IPEA has notified th	be considered to be a written opinion of the not apply where the applicant chooses an a International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) ered.			
IPEA	a written reply to	ogether, where	e, considered to be a writt e appropriate, with amend expiration of 22 months fro	ments, before the exp	PEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the piration of 3 months from the date of mailing whichever expires later.			
	rther options, see							
3. For fu	rther details, see	notes to Form	PCT/ISA/220.					
	mailing address o			Authorized officer	Vilia Dinkon			
Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents				Gollamudi S. Kis	hore, Ph.			
P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450					V Yok			
	lexandria, Virginia Vo. (703) 305-323			Telephone No. 70	J3 308 1234			
	A/237 (cover she		2004)					

(1906) THERTHUME (SEE

# THE WAY TO

# WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US05/00603

Box No	. 1 Basis of this opinion						
1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.							
	This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).						
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:							
a.	type of material						
	a sequence listing						
	table(s) related to the sequence listing						
b.	format of material						
	in written format						
	in computer readable form						
c.	time of filing/furnishing						
	contained in international application as filed.						
	filed together with the international application in computer readable form.						
	furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.						
	·						
	In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.						
4. Additional comments:							

### WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/US05/00603

EST ANALABILE (SOF)

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability 1. The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non-obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of: the entire international application claims Nos. 28 and 31-33 because: the said international application, or the said claim Nos. \_\_\_\_\_ relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (specify): the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. 28 and 31-33 are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify): Claims 28 and 31-33 are multiple dependent claims depending from multiple dependent claims 22-25. the claims, or said claims Nos. \_\_\_\_\_ are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed. no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. \_ the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that: has not been furnished the written form does not comply with the standard has not been furnished the computer readable form does not comply with the standard the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions. See Supplemental Box for further details.

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US05/00603

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement		
Novelty (N)	Claims 2, 4, 15-21, 23-27, 29-30, 34-36 and 38  Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 13, 14, 22 and 37	YES NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims NONE Claims 1-27, 29-30 and 34-38	YESNO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-27, 29-30 and 34-38</u> Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES NO

### 2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 13-4 and 22-23 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by MAUSNER (US 5,571,503).

MAUSNER teaches eye compositions containing C13-14 isoparaffins, mineral oil, squaline, phospholipids, fatty acid esters, cholesteryl behenate, glycerol and medium chain triglycerides (col. 2, line 45 through col. 7, line 5, col. 9, line 33, Tables and claims).

Claim 37 lacks novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by KAUFMAN (US 4,923,699).

KAUFMAN discloses a method of treating dry eye using ointments containing polar lipid, lecithin and non-polar lipid, cholesterol (abstract, col. 5, lines 33-36, col. 10, lines 60-68, col. 17, line 3 and claim 22).

Claims 2, 4, 9-10, 15, 17-21 and 34-38 an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over MAUSNER cited above.

As pointed out above, MAUSNER teaches eye compositions containing Cl3-14 isoparaffins, mineral oil, squaline, phospholipids, fatty acid esters, cholesteryl behenate, glycerol and medium chain triglycerides (col. 2, line 45 through col. 7, line 5, col. 9, line 33, Tables and claims). The amounts of the components in MAUSNER appear to differ from instant amounts. For example, the amounts of phospholipids taught by MAUSNER are up to 1 % and not instantly claimed 2 to 10 %. However, in the absence of showing unexpected results it is deemed obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to vary the amounts of the components of MAUSNER to obtain the best possible results. MAUSNER also does not teach the composition in an ointment form without water. However, it is evident from MAUSNER's tables, water is added to dissolve the water soluble components such as plant extracts and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare a composition in the ointment form if the water soluble components are not necessary. MAUSNER also does not teach instantly claimed mode of administration. In the absence of showing unexpected results, the mode of administration is deemed to be the choice of the artisan.

Claims 11, 12, 16, 22-31 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over the prior art as applied in the immediately preceding paragraph and further in view of KORB et al.

MAUSNER does not teach the inclusion of beeswax in the compositions. Such an inclusion however, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art since the reference of KORB shows that beeswax is routinely used in combination with hydrocarbon oils for the treatment of dry eye conditions (see abstract, col. 3, lines 15-23, col. 4, lines 6-42, col. 5, lines 7-48 and Examples 45-48).

Claims 27 and 37 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over MAUSNER in view of KAUFMAN (US 4,923,699) cited above.

What is also lacking in MAUSNER is the teaching of the inclusion of drugs such as cyclosporin.

KAUFMAN while disclosing ophthalmic ointments for dry eye treatment teaches the inclusion of immunosuppressants such as cyclosporin. The compositions further include polar lipid, lecithin and non-polar lipid, cholesterol (abstract, col. 5, lines 33-36, col. 10, lines 60-68, col. 17, line 3 and claim 22). The inclusion of cyclosporin would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art since such an inclusion would provide an immunosuppressant action if needed.

Claims 1-27, 29-30 and 34-38 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meet industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.